

# ANCIENT WISDOM

*A monthly journal devoted to teaching theosophical and occult truths*

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."—Hamlet

VOLUME XVII

OCTOBER, 1951—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 8

## IS PEACE BETTER THAN WAR?

BY ARTHUR JACOBY

Editor's Foreword: The article printed below was submitted to ANCIENT WISDOM on May 26th last, accompanied by the following letter:

"As a recent subscriber to your periodical, 'Ancient Wisdom' may I express keen appreciation for your forthright conduct of its affairs. The May 1951 issue appealed to me for its clarity in presenting the issues in our present election.

This has called forth a letter from the National President which you publish in your June 1951 issue. That letter states:

"If there is felt that some inadequacy exists in the conduct of the affairs of our Society at this time, then it would seem more appropriate that the matter be brought to the attention of the Society's membership through the pages of its established journal."

But these pages are not open for the expression of differing views. In the Jan. 1951 issue of 'The American Theosophist' there appears a leading article entitled, 'Is War Better Than Peace.' Because of its authorship and its circulation in our journal, it is apt to carry considerable influence to many of the membership.

Together with other members who disagree with the views expressed in that article, I sent a reply in Jan. 1951 to the Editor of 'The American Theosophist.' The receipt of this article was acknowledged to me by the Wheaton office; but up to the present date this article has not been permitted to enter the pages of 'The American Theosophist.' One of several of my fellow members who aided me in this reply is a lady whose son was killed in World War II. She wrote to our officials at Wheaton, requesting that a reply be published so that the effects of advocating war might in some measure be counteracted, but her request was ignored.

Accordingly I am enclosing a copy of this article with a reverse title, 'Is Peace Better Than War.' Perhaps you will find space for it in 'Ancient Wisdom' and if so, it may exert some little effect in overcoming the article advocating war."

We agreed to publish this controversial article, firstly because it has long been our opinion that constructive controversy (minus personalities) is for the good of the movement and we  
(Continued on Page 63)

## ENVIRONMENT, HEREDITY OR SOUL HISTORY

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

I

Of the making of many books on what ails humanity there is no end. Every few months a "best seller" from some well-known psychiatrist, physician, clergyman or other dissector of mental and emotional morbidity evokes paeans from the reviewers and dollars from the public. Some of these works are sent us for review, which we seldom give as we do not have the space. Some we buy, out of a combined sense of duty to our readers and genuine desire to keep abreast of new things in the field of psychology. Occasionally we do find something really good and novel—something we can pass along in ANCIENT WISDOM. Sometimes we discover something so obviously incomplete or even false in the light of Theosophy that we can also pass it on for its negative value. Most of the time, however—and we hate to say it—we find nothing new but mere hashed-up Freudian psychology offered with fanfare and huzzahs as a Twentieth Century Revelation.

We have tried to get the gist of all this literature, disregarding jacket blurbs and opinions of reviewers, who often seem more concerned to do a job of epigrammatic writing themselves than to do justice to the book under their notice. In this series we propose to put before ANCIENT WISDOM readers the essence of the conclusions the authors of these works seem to have in common. We know some of our readers are very well posted on this type of literature and, from those who are, we will welcome constructive criticism. If we make any misstatements of fact we are open to correction, but this we shall try, as we always do, to avoid.

So to plunge in. First it seems as though all the frustrations, phobias, wrong outlooks, abnormalities and other ills the mind is heir to, if they cannot be accounted for in any other way, are made to trace back to childhood shocks of some kind or other. When very young or even not so young, the patient had some sort of awful experience that jolted him—or her—so badly that he attempted to suppress all memory of it. But memories will not be suppressed. When treated in that way they fester in the subconscious, eventually revenging themselves by  
(Continued on Page 64)

## THE TWAIN SHALL MEET

BY H. K. SCHOLEFIELD

"Now it is not good for the Christian's health

To hustle the Aryan brown;  
For the Aryan smiles while the Christian riles,

And he wears the Christian down.  
And the end of the fight is a tombstone white,

With the name of the late deceased,  
And the epitaph drear, 'A Fool lies here,  
Who tried to hustle the East'."

Thus wrote Kipling, a student of occultism and a flower of English culture who was gifted with the treasure of understanding of men. His contact with eastern races lay in India where he poured his priceless oil upon troubled waters, lessening friction and substituting understanding for mistrust between two nations during decades while the east sought and gained better knowledge of the greater world, its methods and usages. This earth needs more Kiplings who can make East meet West without clashing. Each of the races has enormous knowledge to impart which the other lacks, the Western people having advanced in knowledge of practical business and science but having meanwhile neglected the inner life, the jewel within, without which the rich and flashy casket is as valueless as a scabbard without a sword. The occult side of life has been fostered in Oriental lands where practical affairs have been neglected, as being of lesser value, which is indeed true. King Midas would have given all the gold in the universe to have his cherished daughter restored, and we Westerners have acquired gold likewise and neglected spiritual values to our eternal loss.

Few indeed are the "whites" who can meet Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos or Indians understandingly; on the approach of the Caucasian that curtain drops over the Oriental face and we see a wooden expression conveying no emotion, no animation and we say they all look so alike it is not possible to tell one from another. Nothing could be more untrue. There is as great a difference between races and individuals there as here; when we grow accusotmed to them it is unmistakable. Chinese and Japanese are supposed to lack feelings because they show none, and this too is wholly contrary to fact. Oriental people feel more  
(Continued on Page 62)



# ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS

*published monthly at*

320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.  
St. Louis 2, Mo.

CHARLES E. LUNTZ, *Editor*

ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, *Publishers*

Entered as second-class matter Sept. 25, 1936, at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscriptions: 1 year \$2.00; 6 months \$1.20; Canada and abroad, 1 year \$2.50.

Single Copies, 20 cents

## THE PROPOSITION THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL

A reader sent us some pages from a 1922 *Adyar Theosophist* containing an article dedicated to the proposition that all men are *not* created equal. The writer bases his case on the theosophical Truth that the monads (the ultimate spirit taking evolution) start their journeys through matter at differing periods. They reach the human stage, some together or nearly together but much earlier or much later. While equal in original spiritual status as "Sons of God," obviously the forms in which they manifest, their personalities, even their Egos, are far from equal.

Some are vastly superior because older. Others are manifestly inferior because younger. Still others are average. Many are equal to each other but none is equal to all.

Even from the worldly angle, which is the only angle the worldly would consider, equality at birth is subject to challenge. The congenitally incurable, blind, crippled, mentally deficient—are these the equals from their natal day with the straight and strong, keen visioned, brilliantly intellectual? Are those of bad heredity always born the equals, bodily or mentally, with those of good heredity? Why then did the Founding Fathers embody in The Declaration of Independence as a "self-evident truth" the proposition that all men are created equal? That document was almost entirely the work of Thomas Jefferson who, among his many accomplishments, was President of the American Philosophical Society. He devoutly believed in God but was a member of no church and professed no creed. Indeed he described creeds as "the bane and ruin of the Christian church."

There was therefore no religious motivation in the pronouncement under consideration. It is a grand pronouncement and it was adapted as a resolution by the General Congress and has served as an inspiration to Americans and to free people everywhere, as well as to those who have struggled to be free, for over 175 years.

But still . . . all men are not created equal. What is the answer? Could Jefferson, with his untrammelled intellect,

wide reading and philosophical knowledge, have meant something deeper by "created" than mere human birth? Could he, in fact, have had in mind what a Theosophist would mean if he used the word (which he would not)—the emergence of the Spirit from its divine housing to begin its aeonic task of conquering the lower planes?

Whether he meant that—or something akin to it—or not, it seems that this indeed is the real self-evident truth. Men are born with widely varying heredity, opportunities, physical structures and intellectual endowments according as they are young or old in evolution and according, also, as they have earned or require fullness or incompleteness for their greatest progress at a given stage. The "old soul"—"young soul" concept cannot be carried too far and could be very harmful if employed in the wrong way by people with their own axes to grind.

"I have everything—fine physique, health, wealth, culture, because I am an old soul. You have nothing—an ailing body, impoverishment, sordid surroundings, a hopeless future because you are a young soul. Be content. It's just your bad luck that your Monad started late. You'll catch up in a few hundred thousand years."

Perhaps no one would be cold-blooded enough to talk in that exact way, but with poor understanding of a great occult truth—the little knowledge that is so dangerous—the implication might well be present in the behavior of those temporarily favored by destiny, toward those temporarily straitened and afflicted. Such an attitude, of course would proclaim a very young soul who was, by his paltry gloating, inviting karmic consequences which might well bring him to even lower estate than the object of his contempt.

Yet the caste system of India is based on the idea that the Ego progresses slowly from being an outcast to the Shudra (laboring) group, from there to the Vaishyas (merchants), thence to the Kshatriya (warrior) caste and finally enjoys the inestimable privilege of being born a Brahmin. Perhaps this hope is all that makes living tolerable to the lowly outcasts or Shudras but we wonder how they, or any of the Castes, can be absolutely sure that nature will go along.

It is true that the possible penalty for wrong living is recognized as being born into a lower caste—a dreadful prospect for a top caste Hindu who has (so he might feel) spent hundreds of lives working up to his high estate. As effective, doubtless, in making the faithful toe the religious mark as is the fear of hell for his Christian brother. But it is possible, just possible, that karma may not see eye to eye with a human being as to what constitutes wrong living. It is also possible that a man's progress is put above his pride by those who manage the evolutionary

scheme. In that case he might be jumped from caste to caste forward or backward, or might not even be reborn a Hindu at all. Whatever is best for his spiritual advancement we may be sure is always done, though here again it seems logical that the normal method (subject to many exceptions) may well be to work the Ego up through the Castes progressively.

Which might mean that the Hindu outcast comes to his next birth in a New York slum, but not necessarily. Some of these so-called untouchables are highly intelligent men and women and rebirth might be in the better grades of Society, either Eastern or Western. The Shudra (laborer) does not have to be reborn a Hindu coolie. Birth which would bring him into the ranks of unskilled or skilled labor in the occident is just as likely. The Vaishya (merchant) may blossom forth as a Western business man; the Kshatriya (warrior) as a career soldier in one of the many European armies.

As for the Brahmin, the priesthood or ministry is obviously the place for him if karma requires him to forsake his former land and take a Western incarnation. Or perhaps a profession of some sort which may also be included, if distinguished enough, in the Brahmin group.

This very sketchy survey of karmic possibilities may serve to put a different complexion on the "all men are created equal" concept. In the beginning yes—but the beginning far pre-dates any incarnation in human form.

None of us (unless highly clairvoyant) may know just where we stand in spiritual evolution nor to what "Caste" we permanently belong. Paternal Governments may laudably attempt to provide equal opportunity for all, but a faint approximation is all they can ever reach, for Soul history will not be denied and the older ones will always tend to rise to the top as the younger ones will usually sink to the bottom.

Does this matter so very much as all eternity is before both old and young Souls in which the score will most certainly be evened up? The young Souls in their turn will become the Elder Brethren of the race and the old Souls will pass on to labor in still loftier fields of service. And if Government cannot with all its efforts provide equal opportunities for all, the Karmic Deities with their vastly greater resources and "know-how" will assuredly do so over the long span of lives that will finally bring all men to the perfection that all men are destined to attain.

## "DAVID AND BATH-SHEBA" GOOD—BUT NOT TOO GOOD

The editor has almost reached the conclusion that he ought not to attend biblical movies. Being a stickler for textual accuracy in his own biblical series, it irks him to observe all kinds of non-biblical fal-lals and doodads in-



serted into the scriptural accounts by scenario writers who, to say the least, lack some of the inspiration of the original authors.

We commented on this in our review last year of the much heralded "Samson and Delilah"—a good film but with a number of inexactitudes and additions unwarranted by anything in the original narrative.

Great effort and research has evidently gone into the David-Bath-Sheba production. The director, Darryl Zanuck, comes close to the standing of the incomparable Cecil DeMille who directed "Samson." The play is fast moving and holds the attention, though it seemed a bit unnecessary to show David's walk to the Tabernacle at such length, over interminably long streets, under passageways and along uninteresting roads. As the Tabernacle was parked outside the city walls this might have been taken for granted.

Gregory Peck makes an acceptable David but it seemed to us that Susan Hayward was miscast as Bath-Sheba. That personable actress, with uptilted nose, fair complexion and features as Nordic as the Lorelei's, did little or nothing to fill the concept of the Judaic Bath-Sheba. Her appearance on the screen was the signal for a number of wolf whistles from adolescent members of the audience, which is probably good evidence that her appeal to the mature King David would have been strictly limited—certainly not such as to make him for her sake an accessory to murder.

The acting of the two principal characters was restrained in character—too restrained, we think, to fit the biblical facts. There was nothing restrained about the scriptural David, who was so happy when the Ark of God was brought from a private house into Jerusalem that he "danced before the Lord with all his might" being clad only in a linen "ephod"—a scanty garment most unsuitable for terpsichorean capering. This brought a scornful rebuke from David's wife Michal (II Samuel VI:20) who accused him of shamelessness—a charge resented so fiercely by her husband that he would have nothing more to do with her till the day of her death.

This episode, an integral part of the original account, has been modestly omitted from the film version, doubtless from fear of the Censorship office. Michal and David are from the start portrayed at loggerheads and exchanging bitter taunts, but the reason, as given in the Bible, is not even hinted at. Later Michal is shown as fiercely jealous of Bath-Sheba and conniving with son Absalom to have her stoned for infidelity. This is strictly Hollywood, not Samuel.

The movie people would doubtless insist that it is necessary to read interesting implications into the bare narrative to make the picture acceptable to the groundlings and, if not too

far-fetched, this may be conceded. But first, it would seem, the possibilities of the unadorned story should be fully exploited. If that is done there may be small need or no need for Hollywoodian interpolations.

Thus in the flashback to the Goliath episode very poor justice is done to this, the most dramatic event of David's eventful life. An unconvincing giant, who looks as though he might have come from a sideshow, takes the part of the champion of Gath, "whose height was six cubits and a span" (about ten feet six inches). Nearly all of the outstanding incidents in the biblical account are omitted in the picture, though with proper dramatization they would have been much more attention-compelling than the inventions of the adapter.

The arming of David by King Saul with sword, helmet and coat of mail, which David refused to use, is not shown, though it is an integral part of the story. The choosing of the "five smooth stones out of the brook" is likewise omitted though it would have preserved the biblical continuity. But, poorest judgment of all, the great exchange of challenges between the Philistine and the Israelite youth, known to every Bible student, either fell on the cutting room floor or was never filmed. Goliath is made to utter a few unintelligible insults to which David does not reply and then—Wham! the pebble from the youngster's sling hits him neatly in the center of the forehead and stays there, being evidently glued on, and he falls dead. Which is not the way the Bible tells it. The pebble merely stunned the giant and before he came to, David decapitated him with the giant's own sword—dramatic enough, it would seem, to justify inclusion in the picture even if some of the fictitious conversation put into the mouths of David and wife Michal were omitted. We greatly prefer the stately passages of the original chronicler to the something less than stately lines of the movie script writer.

For comparison by those who see the film, we quote the words, to the omission of which exception is taken above:

"And the Philistine said unto David, Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves? And the Philistine cursed David by his gods.

And the Philistine said unto David, Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field.

Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied.

This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcases of the host of the Philistine this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the

earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.

And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear; for the battle is the Lord's, and he will give you into our hands.

Mr. Peck did a pretty fair job of reciting the Twenty-third Psalm—a better job than other movie stars we have heard and of a great many clergymen. But his reading of these immortal lines was still subject to considerable improvement. Offhand the only film actor we can recall who really knows how to put right emphasis and expression into recital of majestic passages, whether scriptural or more modern gems such as the Gettysburg speech, is Charles Laughton.

Incidentally, as in Samson and Delilah, the cast ought to have gotten together, or the Director to have made ruling, as to the pronunciation of "Philistine." There are in the American College Dictionary three accepted pronunciations and all three were used by the various characters. A small point, but perfection is attained by watching small points.

So much for criticism but, after all that, there is much that is admirable in the production. The photography is superb, the dramatic interest, in spite of its shortcomings, well sustained. Gregory Peck, a fine actor, makes a plausible character of David though lacking the fire one would expect in the warrior monarch of the Bible. Susan Hayward's interpretation of Bath-Sheba will not, we think, satisfy those who know their Bible well. The lesser characters merit great praise. They were all good, without exception. Michal being sufficiently acid and ironic to justify the few words ascribed to her in the Book of Samuel, in which she berates David with fine sarcasm for his ribald behavior. Raymond Massey as the Prophet Nathan looked a little like Abraham Lincoln done up for the occasion.

Perhaps we should answer an unspoken question which may be going through the reader's mind. As we doubt the authenticity of the account from the standpoint of history and esteem it mainly for its occult value, what difference does it make whether the film producers stick to the text or—in the interest of box office and the low I.Q.'s of some of the audiences—introduce the Hollywood clichés so beloved of the "lesser breeds"?

Our reaction is, "If you are going to give them Bible, give them Bible. Make the language and the episode modern and intelligible by all means. But don't change the stories, because you can't do half or a tenth or a hundredth as good a piece of work as the original writers."

Yes, it can be done, and in our humble way, a tiny candle to the Hollywood sun, we do it. We modernize the Bible and Shakespeare and Omar  
(Continued on Page 61)



## IT MAKES NO SENSE THAT—

Theosophy should be regarded by any Theosophist as an orthodox religion even though for a Bible he substitutes *The Secret Doctrine* and for church authority the officialdom, international, national or both of The Theosophical Society.

\* \* \* \*

The persons of leaders living or dead be invested with a sanctity they never claimed, and enshrined in a sort of theosophical pantheon, or at least elevated to sainthood.

\* \* \* \*

The early teachings be reverentially accepted as "a faith once delivered to the saints," not to be added to, subtracted from, modified or altered in any way by later and fuller discovery or correlation with more modern science.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should ape the religions in trying to keep their teachings static and traditional, when approaches to the Truths we teach should be dynamic and constantly fresh, with the fullest relation to the newer concepts of a changing world.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should berate one another for differing viewpoints, seeing that the very essence of Theosophy is the right of each to form and present his own opinions and the right to accept, reject or remain indifferent to the opinions of others.

\* \* \* \*

The Theosophical Society should be operated primarily either as a Church or a business or both, when it is neither, but its results are to be measured only by its success in reaching the non-theosophical public with the theosophic message and in inducing a reasonable number to join it and help carry on its work.

## THE TWAIN SHALL MEET

(Continued from Page 57)

keenly than we, as their consciousness is centered more in their astral bodies; their concealment is a matter of necessity, training and custom and is assumed for the same reason that a turtle wears a hard shell—he is extremely tender underneath it.

The inscrutable Oriental face cannot always conceal joys and sorrows, but we have only twice in many years witnessed Oriental tears: in both cases due to bodily illness with consequent nervous breakdown. This stiff concealment of emotion is less evident among Filipinos and we are inclined to think this is due to the circumstance that they are more individualists and each disposed to go his own merry way, while Chinese and Japanese are clan-

## IT MAKES SENSE THAT—

He should accept the assurance of the heads of the Society, past and present, that their statements are far from infallible and that they do no more than present the truth as they honestly and sincerely understand it to be.

\* \* \* \*

The personages such as Blavatsky, Besant, Leadbeater and others to whom the Society—and the world—owes so much be regarded with respect and their words receive open-minded consideration by Theosophists—but no more than that.

\* \* \* \*

The early teachings be accepted as a groundwork but bearing always in mind that sixty or seventy years ago the public mind was not conditioned to receive more than a very small fragment of occult truth and often revolted against that.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should shun inertia in presenting their philosophy; should avoid stereotyped methods outmoded and useless; should be constantly alert to seize every opportunity the new researches and discoveries of science are bringing to show how closely Science and Theosophy are approaching each other.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should express their differences courteously though as vigorously as may be, omitting personalities and giving credit to their opponents for right motives and honesty, in the absence of unchallengeable proof to the contrary.

\* \* \* \*

Vague claims of the good we are doing without increasing our numbers or the number of those who attend our lectures or buy our books, be discounted as mere unproved assertions, and those on whom the responsibility falls be required to account for their stewardship by citing indisputable facts to show that the Society is progressing and not standing still or falling behind.

nish and unhappy when required to act individually, which they think is bold and improper. It is rudeness, in their view, to say "I think" thus and so; one must first inquire what everybody thinks; nobody should differ impertinently with his neighbor and when a community opinion is formed, each individual takes it for his own and so avoids being offensive. This again expresses the fact that these people are Fourth race groups which center their consciousness less at the mental level and more in the astral than do Caucasians who are less completely prone to be influenced by spellbinding oratory, mass emotion and group-elemental thought-forms, and are more ready to establish each his own, to condemn the ruling party in power and oppose oppressive laws. Consequently, the rude

American deeply offends the Oriental with his outspoken banter and sarcasm and his lack of consideration of other people's feelings, and gets classified as a savage barbarian, an unenlightened oaf and coarse, swaggering bully with no proper deference for the feelings of his fellow-man. Moreover, he frequently gets rated as physically rather dirty in Japan where the racial custom demands a daily bath in scalding water while the American does nicely with a cold shower—quite insufficient in the view of the Japanese. But the most violent clash of views arises over the matter of using pocket-handkerchiefs. When Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, visited New York and was driven through the city, he is reported to have shocked his attendant escorts and dignitaries by leaning over the side of the vehicle to blow the Imperial nose. Yet the distressed escort did not offer a fraction of the pained surprise which His Highness and suite most certainly experienced on seeing Americans, presumably cultured, blow noses in kerchiefs and stuff them into pockets to be carried about all day, perhaps for days. Even the ladies retained this offensive matter in their handbags.

Still worse, our Oriental friends quickly learn of our custom of sending these fouled kerchiefs to the laundry expecting them to be washed, actually together with our clothes and linen, and by the hands of servants! Could human ingenuity devise a worse insult? To the Oriental mind, all forms of human excreta are equally repellent and untouchable, and contact with them is degrading and defiling. Such matter should be disposed of by burial or by fire. The Chinese were using disposable tissues when our ancestors were painting their faces with woad, and in this kerchief matter we have only recently begun to catch up with them and may require another generation to eliminate that filthy object, the used handkerchief, and its carriage in our clothing where it re-infects the user and everyone in the neighborhood with its physical germs, while producing much worse havoc on higher planes where its unseen vibrations create an unclean aura about the unconscious carrier.

We have much to learn and little upon which to assume superior airs. Of course there is another side to the coin and much could be said about the degraded status of Oriental women, child-labor, etc., but this writer is not disposed to seek the mote in a neighbor's eye, particularly in respect of Japanese customs wherein such enormous change and advancement has been effected since the war, especially in these respects, and such admirable spirit of progress manifested in national ideals and purpose to build anew, and to better and higher design.

(The End)



serted into the scriptural accounts by scenario writers who, to say the least, lack some of the inspiration of the original authors.

We commented on this in our review last year of the much heralded "Samson and Delilah"—a good film but with a number of inexactitudes and additions unwarranted by anything in the original narrative.

Great effort and research has evidently gone into the David-Bath-Sheba production. The director, Darryl Zanuck, comes close to the standing of the incomparable Cecil DeMille who directed "Samson." The play is fast moving and holds the attention, though it seemed a bit unnecessary to show David's walk to the Tabernacle at such length, over interminably long streets, under passageways and along uninteresting roads. As the Tabernacle was parked outside the city walls this might have been taken for granted.

Gregory Peck makes an acceptable David but it seemed to us that Susan Hayward was miscast as Bath-Sheba. That personable actress, with uptilted nose, fair complexion and features as Nordic as the Lorelei's, did little or nothing to fill the concept of the Judaic Bath-Sheba. Her appearance on the screen was the signal for a number of wolf whistles from adolescent members of the audience, which is probably good evidence that her appeal to the mature King David would have been strictly limited—certainly not such as to make him for her sake an accessory to murder.

The acting of the two principal characters was restrained in character—too restrained, we think, to fit the biblical facts. There was nothing restrained about the scriptural David, who was so happy when the Ark of God was brought from a private house into Jerusalem that he "danced before the Lord with all his might" being clad only in a linen "ephod"—a scanty garment most unsuitable for terpsichorean capering. This brought a scornful rebuke from David's wife Michal (II Samuel VI:20) who accused him of shamelessness—a charge resented so fiercely by her husband that he would have nothing more to do with her till the day of her death.

This episode, an integral part of the original account, has been modestly omitted from the film version, doubtless from fear of the Censorship office. Michal and David are from the start portrayed as loggerheads and exchanging bitter taunts, but the reason, as given in the Bible, is not even hinted at. Later Michal is shown as fiercely jealous of Bath-Sheba and conniving with son Absalom to have her stoned for infidelity. This is strictly Hollywood, not Samuel.

The movie people would doubtless insist that it is necessary to read interesting implications into the bare narrative to make the picture acceptable to the groundlings and, if not too

far-fetched, this may be conceded. But first, it would seem, the possibilities of the unadorned story should be fully exploited. If that is done there may be small need or no need for Hollywoodian interpolations.

Thus in the flashback to the Goliath episode very poor justice is done to this, the most dramatic event of David's eventful life. An unconvincing giant, who looks as though he might have come from a sideshow, takes the part of the champion of Gath, "whose height was six cubits and a span" (about ten feet six inches). Nearly all of the outstanding incidents in the biblical account are omitted in the picture, though with proper dramatization they would have been much more attention-compelling than the inventions of the adapter.

The arming of David by King Saul with sword, helmet and coat of mail, which David refused to use, is not shown, though it is an integral part of the story. The choosing of the "five smooth stones out of the brook" is likewise omitted though it would have preserved the biblical continuity. But, poorest judgment of all, the great exchange of challenges between the Philistine and the Israelite youth, known to every Bible student, either fell on the cutting room floor or was never filmed. Goliath is made to utter a few unintelligible insults to which David does not reply and then—Wham! the pebble from the youngster's sling hits him neatly in the center of the forehead and stays there, being evidently glued on, and he falls dead. Which is not the way the Bible tells it. The pebble merely stunned the giant and before he came to, David decapitated him with the giant's own sword—dramatic enough, it would seem, to justify inclusion in the picture even if some of the fictitious conversation put into the mouths of David and wife Michal were omitted. We greatly prefer the stately passages of the original chronicler to the something less than stately lines of the movie script writer.

For comparison by those who see the film, we quote the words, to the omission of which exception is taken above:

"And the Philistine said unto David, Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves? And the Philistine cursed David by his gods.

And the Philistine said unto David, Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field.

Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied.

This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcases of the host of the Philistine this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the

earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.

And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear; for the battle is the Lord's and he will give you into our hands.

Mr. Peck did a pretty fair job of reciting the Twenty-third Psalm—a better job than other movie stars we have heard and of a great many clergymen. But his reading of these immortal lines was still subject to considerable improvement. Offhand the only film actor we can recall who really knows how to put right emphasis and expression into recital of majestic passages, whether scriptural or more modern gems such as the Gettysburg speech, is Charles Laughton.

Incidentally, as in Samson and Delilah, the cast ought to have gotten together, or the Director to have made ruling, as to the pronunciation of "Philistine." There are in the American College Dictionary three accepted pronunciations and all three were used by the various characters. A small point, but perfection is attained by watching small points.

So much for criticism but, after all that, there is much that is admirable in the production. The photography is superb, the dramatic interest, in spite of its shortcomings, well sustained. Gregory Peck, a fine actor, makes a plausible character of David though lacking the fire one would expect in the warrior monarch of the Bible. Susan Hayward's interpretation of Bath-Sheba will not, we think, satisfy those who know their Bible well. The lesser characters merit great praise. They were all good, without exception. Michal being sufficiently acid and ironic to justify the few words ascribed to her in the Book of Samuel, in which she berates David with fine sarcasm for his ribald behavior. Raymond Massey as the Prophet Nathan looked little like Abraham Lincoln done up for the occasion.

Perhaps we should answer an unspoken question which may be going through the reader's mind. As we doubt the authenticity of the account from the standpoint of history and esteem it mainly for its occult value, what difference does it make whether the film producers stick to the text or—in the interest of box office and the low I.Q.'s of some of the audiences—introduce the Hollywood clichés so beloved of the "lesser breeds"?

Our reaction is, "If you are going to give them Bible, give them Bible. Make the language and the episode modern and intelligible by all means. But don't change the stories, because you can't do half or a tenth or a hundredth as good a piece of work as the original writers."

Yes, it can be done, and in our humble way, a tiny candle to the Hollywood sun, we do it. We modernize the Bible and Shakespeare and Omar

(Continued on Page 61)



## IT MAKES NO SENSE THAT—

Theosophy should be regarded by any Theosophist as an orthodox religion even though for a Bible he substitutes *The Secret Doctrine* and for church authority the officialdom, international, national or both of The Theosophical Society.

\* \* \* \*

The persons of leaders living or dead be invested with a sanctity they never claimed, and enshrined in a sort of theosophical pantheon, or at least elevated to sainthood.

\* \* \* \*

The early teachings be reverentially accepted as "a faith once delivered to the saints," not to be added to, subtracted from, modified or altered in any way by later and fuller discovery or correlation with more modern science.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should ape the religions in trying to keep their teachings static and traditional, when approaches to the Truths we teach should be dynamic and constantly fresh, with the fullest relation to the newer concepts of a changing world.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should berate one another for differing viewpoints, seeing that the very essence of Theosophy is the right of each to form and present his own opinions and the right to accept, reject or remain indifferent to the opinions of others.

\* \* \* \*

The Theosophical Society should be operated primarily either as a Church or a business or both, when it is neither, but its results are to be measured only by its success in reaching the non-theosophical public with the theosophic message and in inducing a reasonable number to join it and help carry on its work.

## THE TWAIN SHALL MEET

(Continued from Page 57)

keenly than we, as their consciousness is centered more in their astral bodies; their concealment is a matter of necessity, training and custom and is assumed for the same reason that a turtle wears a hard shell—he is extremely tender underneath it.

The inscrutable Oriental face cannot always conceal joys and sorrows, but we have only twice in many years witnessed Oriental tears: in both cases due to bodily illness with consequent nervous breakdown. This stiff concealment of emotion is less evident among Filipinos and we are inclined to think this is due to the circumstance that they are more individualists and each disposed to go his own merry way, while Chinese and Japanese are clan-

## IT MAKES SENSE THAT—

He should accept the assurance of the heads of the Society, past and present, that their statements are far from infallible and that they do no more than present the truth as they honestly and sincerely understand it to be.

\* \* \* \*

The personages such as Blavatsky, Besant, Leadbeater and others to whom the Society—and the world—owes so much be regarded with respect and their words receive open-minded consideration by Theosophists—but no more than that.

\* \* \* \*

The early teachings be accepted as a groundwork but bearing always in mind that sixty or seventy years ago the public mind was not conditioned to receive more than a very small fragment of occult truth and often revolted against that.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should shun inertia in presenting their philosophy; should avoid stereotyped methods outmoded and useless; should be constantly alert to seize every opportunity the new researches and discoveries of science are bringing to show how closely Science and Theosophy are approaching each other.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should express their differences courteously though as vigorously as may be, omitting personalities and giving credit to their opponents for right motives and honesty, in the absence of unchallengeable proof to the contrary.

\* \* \* \*

Vague claims of the good we are doing without increasing our numbers or the number of those who attend our lectures or buy our books, be discounted as mere unproved assertions, and those on whom the responsibility falls be required to account for their stewardship by citing indisputable facts to show that the Society is progressing and not standing still or falling behind.

nish and unhappy when required to act individually, which they think is bold and improper. It is rudeness, in their view, to say "I think" thus and so; one must first inquire what everybody thinks; nobody should differ impertinently with his neighbor and when a community opinion is formed, each individual takes it for his own and so avoids being offensive. This again expresses the fact that these people are Fourth race groups which center their consciousness less at the mental level and more in the astral than do Caucasians who are less completely prone to be influenced by spellbinding oratory, mass emotion and group-elemental thought-forms, and are more ready to establish each his own, to condemn the ruling party in power and oppose oppressive laws. Consequently, the rude

American deeply offends the Oriental with his outspoken banter and sarcasm and his lack of consideration of other people's feelings, and gets classified as a savage barbarian, an unenlightened oaf and coarse, swaggering bully with no proper deference for the feelings of his fellow-man. Moreover, he frequently gets rated as physically rather dirty in Japan where the racial custom demands a daily bath in scalding water while the American does nicely with a cold shower—quite insufficient in the view of the Japanese. But the most violent clash of views arises over the matter of using pocket-handkerchiefs. When Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, visited New York and was driven through the city, he is reported to have shocked his attendant escorts and dignitaries by leaning over the side of the vehicle to blow the Imperial nose. Yet the distressed escort did not offer a fraction of the pained surprise which His Highness and suite most certainly experienced on seeing Americans, presumably cultured, blow noses in kerchiefs and stuff them into pockets to be carried about all day, perhaps for days. Even the ladies retained this offensive matter in their handbags.

Still worse, our Oriental friends quickly learn of our custom of sending these fouled kerchiefs to the laundry expecting them to be washed, actually together with our clothes and linen, and by the hands of servants! Could human ingenuity devise a worse insult? To the Oriental mind, all forms of human excreta are equally repellent and untouchable, and contact with them is degrading and defiling. Such matter should be disposed of by burial or by fire. The Chinese were using disposable tissues when our ancestors were painting their faces with woad, and in this kerchief matter we have only recently begun to catch up with them and may require another generation to eliminate that filthy object, the used handkerchief, and its carriage in our clothing where it re-infects the user and everyone in the neighborhood with its physical germs, while producing much worse havoc on higher planes where its unseen vibrations create an unclean aura about the unconscious carrier.

We have much to learn and little upon which to assume superior airs. Of course there is another side to the coin and much could be said about the degraded status of Oriental women, child-labor, etc., but this writer is not disposed to seek the mote in a neighbor's eye, particularly in respect of Japanese customs wherein such enormous change and advancement has been effected since the war, especially in these respects, and such admirable spirit of progress manifested in national ideals and purpose to build anew, and to better and higher design.

(The End)



serted into the scriptural accounts by scenario writers who, to say the least, lack some of the inspiration of the original authors.

We commented on this in our review last year of the much heralded "Samson and Delilah"—a good film but with a number of inexactitudes and additions unwarranted by anything in the original narrative.

Great effort and research has evidently gone into the David-Bath-Sheba production. The director, Darryl Zanuck, comes close to the standing of the incomparable Cecil DeMille who directed "Samson." The play is fast moving and holds the attention, though it seemed a bit unnecessary to show David's walk to the Tabernacle at such length, over interminably long streets, under passageways and along uninteresting roads. As the Tabernacle was parked outside the city walls this might have been taken for granted.

Gregory Peck makes an acceptable David but it seemed to us that Susan Hayward was miscast as Bath-Sheba. That personable actress, with uptilted nose, fair complexion and features as Nordic as the Lorelei's, did little or nothing to fill the concept of the Judaic Bath-Sheba. Her appearance on the screen was the signal for a number of wolf whistles from adolescent members of the audience, which is probably good evidence that her appeal to the mature King David would have been strictly limited—certainly not such as to make him for her sake an accessory to murder.

The acting of the two principal characters was restrained in character—too restrained, we think, to fit the biblical facts. There was nothing restrained about the scriptural David, who was so happy when the Ark of God was brought from a private house into Jerusalem that he "danced before the Lord with all his might" being clad only in a linen "ephod"—a scanty garment most unsuitable for terpsichorean capering. This brought a scornful rebuke from David's wife Michal (II Samuel VI:20) who accused him of shamelessness—a charge resented so fiercely by her husband that he would have nothing more to do with her till the day of her death.

This episode, an integral part of the original account, has been modestly omitted from the film version, doubtless from fear of the Censorship office. Michal and David are from the start portrayed at loggerheads and exchanging bitter taunts, but the reason, as given in the Bible, is not even hinted at. Later Michal is shown as fiercely jealous of Bath-Sheba and conniving with son Absalom to have her stoned for infidelity. This is strictly Hollywood, not Samuel.

The movie people would doubtless insist that it is necessary to read interesting implications into the bare narrative to make the picture acceptable to the groundlings and, if not too

far-fetched, this may be conceded. But first, it would seem, the possibilities of the unadorned story should be fully exploited. If that is done there may be small need or no need for Hollywoodian interpolations.

Thus in the flashback to the Goliath episode very poor justice is done to this, the most dramatic event of David's eventful life. An unconvincing giant, who looks as though he might have come from a sideshow, takes the part of the champion of Gath, "whose height was six cubits and a span" (about ten feet six inches). Nearly all of the outstanding incidents in the biblical account are omitted in the picture, though with proper dramatization they would have been much more attention-compelling than the inventions of the adapter.

The arming of David by King Saul with sword, helmet and coat of mail, which David refused to use, is not shown, though it is an integral part of the story. The choosing of the "five smooth stones out of the brook" is likewise omitted though it would have preserved the biblical continuity. But, poorest judgment of all, the great exchange of challenges between the Philistine and the Israelite youth, known to every Bible student, either fell on the cutting room floor or was never filmed. Goliath is made to utter a few unintelligible insults to which David does not reply and then—Wham! the pebble from the youngster's sling hits him neatly in the center of the forehead and stays there, being evidently glued on, and he falls dead. Which is not the way the Bible tells it. The pebble merely stunned the giant and before he came to, David decapitated him with the giant's own sword—dramatic enough, it would seem, to justify inclusion in the picture even if some of the fictitious conversation put into the mouths of David and wife Michal were omitted. We greatly prefer the stately passages of the original chronicler to the something less than stately lines of the movie script writer.

For comparison by those who see the film, we quote the words, to the omission of which exception is taken above: "And the Philistine said unto David, Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves? And the Philistine cursed David by his gods.

And the Philistine said unto David, Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field.

Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied.

This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcases of the host of the Philistine this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the

earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.

And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear; for the battle is the Lord's and he will give you into our hands.

Mr. Peck did a pretty fair job of reciting the Twenty-third Psalm—a better job than other movie stars we have heard and of a great many clergymen. But his reading of these immortal lines was still subject to considerable improvement. Offhand the only film actor we can recall who really knows how to put right emphasis and expression into recital of majestic passages, whether scriptural or more modern gems such as the Gettysburg speech, is Charles Laughton.

Incidentally, as in Samson and Delilah, the cast ought to have gotten together, or the Director to have made a ruling, as to the pronunciation of "Philistine." There are in the American College Dictionary three accepted pronunciations and all three were used by the various characters. A small point, but perfection is attained by watching small points.

So much for criticism but, after all that, there is much that is admirable in the production. The photography is superb, the dramatic interest, in spite of its shortcomings, well sustained. Gregory Peck, a fine actor, makes a plausible character of David though lacking the fire one would expect in the warrior monarch of the Bible. Susan Hayward's interpretation of Bath-Sheba will not, we think, satisfy those who know their Bible well. The lesser characters merit great praise. They were all good, without exception. Michal being sufficiently acid and ironic to justify the few words ascribed to her in the Book of Samuel, in which she berates David with fine sarcasm for his ribald behavior. Raymond Massey as the Prophet Nathan looked a little like Abraham Lincoln done up for the occasion.

Perhaps we should answer an unspoken question which may be going through the reader's mind. As we doubt the authenticity of the account from the standpoint of history and esteem it mainly for its occult value, what difference does it make whether the film producers stick to the text or—in the interest of box office and the low I.Q.'s of some of the audiences—introduce the Hollywood clichés so beloved of the "lesser breeds"?

Our reaction is, "If you are going to give them Bible, give them Bible. Make the language and the episodes modern and intelligible by all means. But don't change the stories, because you can't do half or a tenth or a hundredth as good a piece of work as the original writers."

Yes, it can be done, and in our humble way, a tiny candle to the Hollywood sun, we do it. We modernize the Bible and Shakespeare and Omar  
(Continued on Page 61)



## ASTROLOGY AND THE WAR SITUATION

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

(Concluded from Last Month)

It is ten months since this series started, the first article appearing in January 1951, and it has been run—with one exception—each month since. It seems in order, therefore, to take stock of the forecasts made that readers may determine their accuracy in the light of the actual events.

In January the following statement was made (p. 91 1st column):

"... the Chinese started their aggression in Korea under the finest possible eclipse aspects for them, and the worst possible for us.

"Which does not mean that the ultimate outcome will put them at the top and us at the bottom in the present conflict which, in all its ramifications, promises astrologically to be a long-drawn-out affair. A Government (Red China) with 62 percent good and 38 percent bad aspects, cannot permanently prevail against a Nation (the United States) with 79 percent good and 21 percent bad aspects. Though if their current influences and influences for some time to come are very good, and ours—as is unfortunately the case—are quite bad, they can give us a hard way to go."

On the front page of ANCIENT WISDOM for March 1951 appears the following:

"The Solar Eclipses favor Red China and discriminate against the United States until next September 1st when a significant change takes place... it marks at least the beginning of the end for the Chinese of their remarkable run of good Eclipse aspects. If they are astrologically wise—and we think they are—they will, under these aspects try to make the best deal they can for themselves and stop the shooting, especially as Pluto in November goes stationary over their Jupiter (very bad). If they do not, we hazard the opinion that they will live—if they live—to regret it..."

"It is hard to see, astrologically speaking, how we can make great headway against China until after next September."

As this is written (September 14th) the consensus of informed opinion seems to be that the Red Chinese, in spite of their big talk, are extremely anxious for a truce and are casting about for ways to get one while still having the precious oriental commodity—"face." The Japanese Peace Treaty has been signed without their participation (which was not invited) and, in spite of Mr. Gromyko's assurance that he would prolong the proceedings for a month, it was signed on time—in less than a week. Any bargaining advantage they expected to get from their big bullying brother holding up the signing did not materialize.

The forecasts quoted above appear to have been reflected closely by what has happened since they were made. Red China may, if she still has not taken enough punishment, continue her mad defiance of the United Nations until August 1952. After that, she is astrologically washed up. Even by November 1951 she is taking a fearful risk to continue the war, with Pluto bearing down on her Jupiter. The Solar Eclipse, which has for nearly a year enabled her to challenge the potentially most powerful country and combination of countries in the world, has now almost forsaken her. In February it deals her another blow—in August of next year if she has been so foolhardy as to remain to fight a losing war, it will close in for the kill.

We do not believe Red China wants any more of what she is getting now. Aside from the physical aspects of the situation, she must know, as Hitler knew, that her gamble of a quick knockout under early favoring aspects has failed. He knew but he kept on, hoping for a miracle. The Communists, Chinese or otherwise, do not believe in miracles. There was a lot of big talk about driving the United Nations forces into the sea. That sounds familiar. The Fuehrer, the Duce and the Kaiser called a similar tune and sang virtually the same words. They were very much off-key and so are the Red Chinese. For all of our formidably bad configurations of the past year we are still well north of that unhappy 38th Parallel—and so are the Red Chinese, with insignificant exceptions. Their adventure has not paid off.

Should the USSR come in full scale, of course, the situation would be entirely changed, as it was changed when China intervened to help the North Koreans. We have given it as our opinion that Russia will not start anything major in 1951—her own aspects are too indifferent. What about 1952? Beginning with the most important of the planets concerned, Pluto, Russia has to beware of the opposition of this transiting planet to her Uranus in the fourth house (outcomes and also the homeland) and in Aquarius (hopes, wishes and ambitions). This opposition was exact during the week the San Francisco Conference was held. The date was not selected by Russia, and the outcome, with its blighting of her "hopes, wishes and ambitions" to wreck the Japanese Peace Treaty is now a matter of history.

During 1952, this aspect holds until October, being constantly stronger for harm. But by October our own inhibiting Plutonian opposition (to its natal place and the Moon) will have lifted. Uranus rules aircraft, and is part ruler of the atom bomb. Pity Russia if she invites the attention of this pair while they oppose each other in her horoscope.

Neptune helps her (trine Uranus) from the latter half of February to

the middle of October. However it also helps us (trine our Mars) to the middle of April and again from the latter part of August to the end of the year. Russia would, in event of war, probably have a field day with her submarines during the 3½ month period when her Neptune was not held in check by ours.

Uranus in 12 Cancer aids the Kremlin, with natal Moon in 12 Virgo through January and bears down on our Sun (conjunction) the first half of the month. However, in February it squares Russia's Jupiter, but also our Uranus. These "cancelling out" aspects are not likely to weigh with any consulting astrologer, if the Kremlin has such (which we think). It is the outstanding configurations only that are likely to be considered, as with Hitler—and these are such that *they counsel definitely, solemnly and finally against starting a war in 1952, as they did in 1951.*

Russia simply has not (astrologically speaking) what it takes to win a war with this country, let alone with the entire United Nations. Aside from our magnificent natal chart, which dwarfs her own by a huge margin, her current influences and those for a year ahead would certainly make it national suicide if she started one. Five-and-a-half years ago when her aspects were almost incredibly good she may have had an outside chance in spite of the natal discrepancies. She did not choose, fortunately for ourselves as we were entirely unprepared, to risk it. Now, thanks to her shortsighted Korean policy, the whole world outside of the iron curtain is alerted to her machinations.

We cannot know what goes on in the devious minds of those charged with the destinies of what once was a great country and which some day, when it has shaken itself free from the awful incubus of its present government, will be a great country again. But if one may hazard a guess, they must be beginning to wonder how long the rest of the world will permit them to retain their present ill-gotten gains, let alone acquire any more. If they dream of being able to out-arm the United States and its allies, they are dreaming indeed. Does it occur to them, perhaps, that in two or three years we will have reached the point where we will no longer have to beg, to argue, to appeal to justice where there is no justice, but where we can DEMAND that Russia retreat to her own borders, lead her own life and let other nations lead theirs. Demand this and be ready and able to enforce the demand if it is refused or ignored.

We do not say this will happen, but with the kind of philosophy the Kremlin holds it is far from unlikely that this possibility is envisaged by the apostles of force who rule there. If they can hang on to what they have, they may regard themselves as very lucky—as indeed they will be—with-



out inviting the dismal fate that history records for every would-be world conqueror back to the first madman to try it.

The closing words of a recent article by a well-known war authority sum up most excellently the present situation, both astrologically and physically, as we see it:

"The Russians and Chinese have hitherto defied and scorned that United Nations resolution" (to establish Korea as a neutral and independent state). "They will be wise to hurry in changing their attitude."

And if we read the astrological indicators aright (and they did not fail us through the World War) that is not the only thing on which their attitude had better be changed. Otherwise . . . too bad both for Red Russia and Red China.

(The End)

## "COME YE DISCONSOLATE . . ."

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

Title (only) from a well-known hymn

If the world seems not to make  
Any sort of sense;  
Living here a bad mistake,  
Only trouble and heartbreak  
And malvolence;

If you cannot seem to find  
Any true philosophy  
That explains why humankind  
Is with evil so entwined,  
Why not try Theosophy?

Those with no cognition  
Of its source august  
View it with suspicion  
As a superstition;  
Treat it with disgust.

Do not take their word for it  
But investigate.  
Study it a little bit—  
There is nothing counterfeit  
To assimilate.

Through recorded history  
True it is that ever,  
Frightened at all mystery,  
Every blind consistency  
Damns each new endeavor.

Theosophy has had its share  
Of this crude damnation.  
Target of attacks unfair,  
Misrepresented everywhere,  
It has THE EXPLANATION.

Put your bafflements to rout—  
This Wisdom is far-reaching.  
Unlike faith of the devout,  
Broad and clear and free of doubt  
You will find its teaching.

## THE ZODIAC IN ALEXANDER POPE

Libra

It is not strength but art obtains the prize.  
—The Iliad

## DO YOU KNOW?—

That most Theosophists are of opinion that the best way to dispose of the earthly remains after physical death is by cremation?

\* \* \* \*

That every commonsense argument favors this course and arguments against are based entirely on misunderstanding as to the complete unimportance of the body once the Ego has left it?

\* \* \* \*

That the notion that somehow the dead person will feel the flames burning him up seems to be held, perhaps a little shamefacedly, by people whose reasoning powers should surely convince them otherwise?

\* \* \* \*

That once the life has departed the body has no feeling of any kind in it, and in this country, where embalming is practised even if the remains are to be cremated, there is not the slightest chance that premature cremation could occur?

\* \* \* \*

That the grossly superstitious concept that if the body be cremated it will interfere with the "resurrection of the dead" is equally childish, as if such really is to take place the remains will long since have moldered to dust?

\* \* \* \*

That as the Theosophist knows the true resurrection to be reincarnation—birth into a new body with new parentage right here on earth—the idea that there will be this further use for his remains at some remote period in the future is not even considered?

\* \* \* \*

That one who has left for the higher planes has no more interest in the body he has dropped than he had in the several bodies he wore out and replaced while living on the physical plane? (See Editorial, "Reincarnation While You Wait," August 1951 issue).

\* \* \* \*

That as virtually all cemeteries, in course of time, are converted to other uses, becoming real-estate subdivisions, railroad property, or something equally prosaic, the elaborate care bestowed on burial sites can at best be only temporary?

\* \* \* \*

That while respect for the remains which are the former habitation of one who was loved is understandable and right, the identification of the lifeless tenement with the departed soul is to be deprecated?

\* \* \* \*

That disposing of these remains in the cleanly and efficient way which modern cremation methods employ, seems to the Theosophist to show far more respect than interring them and allowing them to be destroyed slowly but just as surely as by cremation?

\* \* \* \*

That as the etheric double decom-

poses *pari passu* with its dense counterpart after death, remaining in the vicinity of the latter and being visible in various stages of decay to anyone slightly clairvoyant, whereas it is instantly eliminated by cremation, this is another reason in favor of the latter?

\* \* \* \*

That as etheric clairvoyance is gradually developing in the race in course of evolution, there must come a time when decaying etheric doubles in cemeteries will be visible to everyone and will bring about universal cremation—for aesthetic, if for no other reasons?

## DAVID AND BATH-SHEBA GOOD—BUT NOT TO GOOD

(Continued from Page 59)

Khayyam in our series dealing with them but never—no never—not even hardly ever—do we tamper with the text. Never do we interpolate, add or modify. That is why we take a direct view of Hollywood "improvements" of Holy Writ.

But Bath-Sheba is worth seeing. We suggest you see it.

\* \* \* \*

Note: Since the above was written a review of the film has appeared in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* under the heading "Hollywood Re-writes the Scriptures." Evidently we are not alone in our reaction.

We are unable to feel sorry for the sad plight of Gromyko & Co. at San Francisco. They came with the obvious purpose of wrecking the Treaty of failing that, of doing as much damage as possible to the Cause of the United Nations. They deserved the fate that befell them. In less diplomatic language than the official account of the proceedings would employ, it might be described as "the bum's rush."

President Truman has stated that the new weapons we have in production are "fantastic." And if Russia decides to challenge the growing might of the United Nations, her action in doing so will also be fantastic.

What happens when an irresistible force meets an immovable body? We at San Francisco the "immovable body" found the skids so well greased that it just *had* to move.

Regardless of all the attempts made by journalistic pessimists to show that somehow the Kremlin has benefited by the war in Korea, it seems obvious that instigating it was the most asinine thing they could possibly have done. By unifying the world outside of the iron curtain and bringing about the enormous rearmament programs now in motion, it ruined the Kremlin's ambitious plan of world conquest and confronted Russia for the first time since World War II with potential power superior to her own. "Those whom the gods . . ."



## IT MAKES NO SENSE THAT—

Theosophy should be regarded by any Theosophist as an orthodox religion even though for a Bible he substitutes *The Secret Doctrine* and for church authority the officialdom, international, national or both of The Theosophical Society.

\* \* \* \*

The persons of leaders living or dead be invested with a sanctity they never claimed, and enshrined in a sort of theosophical pantheon, or at least elevated to sainthood.

\* \* \* \*

The early teachings be reverentially accepted as "a faith once delivered to the saints," not to be added to, subtracted from, modified or altered in any way by later and fuller discovery or correlation with more modern science.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should ape the religions in trying to keep their teachings static and traditional, when approaches to the Truths we teach should be dynamic and constantly fresh, with the fullest relation to the newer concepts of a changing world.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should berate one another for differing viewpoints, seeing that the very essence of Theosophy is the right of each to form and present his own opinions and the right to accept, reject or remain indifferent to the opinions of others.

\* \* \* \*

The Theosophical Society should be operated primarily either as a Church or a business or both, when it is neither, but its results are to be measured only by its success in reaching the non-theosophical public with the theosophic message and in inducing a reasonable number to join it and help carry on its work.

## THE TWAIN SHALL MEET

(Continued from Page 57)

seemly than we, as their consciousness is centered more in their astral bodies; their concealment is a matter of necessity, training and custom and is assumed for the same reason that a turtle wears a hard shell—he is extremely tender underneath it.

The inscrutable Oriental face cannot always conceal joys and sorrows, but we have only twice in many years witnessed Oriental tears: in both cases due to bodily illness with consequent nervous breakdown. This stiff concealment of emotion is less evident among Filipinos and we are inclined to think this is due to the circumstance that they are more individualists and each disposed to go his own merry way, while Chinese and Japanese are clan-

## IT MAKES SENSE THAT—

He should accept the assurance of the heads of the Society, past and present, that their statements are far from infallible and that they do no more than present the truth as they honestly and sincerely understand it to be.

\* \* \* \*

The personages such as Blavatsky, Besant, Leadbeater and others to whom the Society—and the world—owes so much be regarded with respect and their words receive open-minded consideration by Theosophists—but no more than that.

\* \* \* \*

The early teachings be accepted as a groundwork but bearing always in mind that sixty or seventy years ago the public mind was not conditioned to receive more than a very small fragment of occult truth and often revolted against that.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should shun inertia in presenting their philosophy; should avoid stereotyped methods outmoded and useless; should be constantly alert to seize every opportunity the new researches and discoveries of science are bringing to show how closely Science and Theosophy are approaching each other.

\* \* \* \*

Theosophists should express their differences courteously though as vigorously as may be, omitting personalities and giving credit to their opponents for right motives and honesty, in the absence of unchallengeable proof to the contrary.

\* \* \* \*

Vague claims of the good we are doing without increasing our numbers or the number of those who attend our lectures or buy our books, be discounted as mere unproved assertions, and those on whom the responsibility falls be required to account for their stewardship by citing indisputable facts to show that the Society is progressing and not standing still or falling behind.

nish and unhappy when required to act individually, which they think is bold and improper. It is rudeness, in their view, to say "I think" thus and so; one must first inquire what everybody thinks; nobody should differ impertinently with his neighbor and when a community opinion is formed, each individual takes it for his own and so avoids being offensive. This again expresses the fact that these people are Fourth race groups which center their consciousness less at the mental level and more in the astral than do Caucasians who are less completely prone to be influenced by spellbinding oratory, mass emotion and group-elemental thought-forms, and are more ready to establish each his own, to condemn the ruling party in power and oppose oppressive laws. Consequently, the rude

American deeply offends the Oriental with his outspoken banter and sarcasm and his lack of consideration of other people's feelings, and gets classified as a savage barbarian, an unenlightened oaf and coarse, swaggering bully with no proper deference for the feelings of his fellow-man. Moreover, he frequently gets rated as physically rather dirty in Japan where the racial custom demands a daily bath in scalding water while the American does nicely with a cold shower—quite insufficient in the view of the Japanese. But the most violent clash of views arises over the matter of using pocket-handkerchiefs. When Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, visited New York and was driven through the city, he is reported to have shocked his attendant escorts and dignitaries by leaning over the side of the vehicle to blow the Imperial nose. Yet the distressed escort did not offer a fraction of the pained surprise which His Highness and suite most certainly experienced on seeing Americans, presumably cultured, blow noses in kerchiefs and stuff them into pockets to be carried about all day, perhaps for days. Even the ladies retained this offensive matter in their handbags.

Still worse, our Oriental friends quickly learn of our custom of sending these fouled kerchiefs to the laundry expecting them to be washed, actually together with our clothes and linen, and by the hands of servants! Could human ingenuity devise a worse insult? To the Oriental mind, all forms of human excreta are equally repellent and untouchable, and contact with them is degrading and defiling. Such matter should be disposed of by burial or by fire. The Chinese were using disposable tissues when our ancestors were painting their faces with woad, and in this kerchief matter we have only recently begun to catch up with them and may require another generation to eliminate that filthy object, the used handkerchief, and its carriage in our clothing where it re-infects the user and everyone in the neighborhood with its physical germs, while producing much worse havoc on higher planes where its unseen vibrations create an unclean aura about the unconscious carrier.

We have much to learn and little upon which to assume superior airs. Of course there is another side to the coin and much could be said about the degraded status of Oriental women, child-labor, etc., but this writer is not disposed to seek the mote in a neighbor's eye, particularly in respect of Japanese customs wherein such enormous change and advancement has been effected since the war, especially in these respects, and such admirable spirit of progress manifested in national ideals and purpose to build anew, and to better and higher design.

(The End)



## IS PEACE BETTER THAN WAR?

(Continued from Page 57)

have published many criticizing or taking exception to our own views. Secondly, it would seem that the author has had no success in obtaining publicity for his well-written article in the national publication. ANCIENT WISDOM has given space to several able writers who, because of their dissenting opinions, were likewise unable to secure a hearing in the official organ.

Our doing so, either in the present or in other instances, does not necessarily mean that we endorse these opinions. Nor does it mean that we oppose them. We believe, however, that both sides of a controversial question should be presented if the dissenters have adequate literary ability to state their side acceptably.

We think it a great mistake for a publication, official or independent, to print only articles or letters that commend—to suppress those that oppose, if the opposition is factual and the arguments advanced worthy of consideration. No reader can deny that we practice what we preach. And so we hope that no one will assume that our printing Mr. Jacoby's article (which he has now withdrawn from the official publication, otherwise we informed him we could not publish it) means that we are taking sides in this controversy. We will gladly print a reply from the writer of the original article that called it forth, if he cares to submit one. Mr. Jacoby's article follows.

\* \* \* \*

On page 1 of the current issue (Jan. 1951) of "The American Theosophist" there appears an article entitled, "Is War Better Than Peace?" From this article, the following are verbatim excerpts:

Page 1: "There are certain conditions in what we call Peace, that give opportunity after opportunity to the unscrupulous to exploit the helpless masses."

Then why are we not out in the field, we who proclaim Brotherhood, in order to exert every possible effort to remedy these abuses? Let us enter these activities so that we can bring our influence to bear; so that we can aid in condemning and correcting such conditions. If we know that these wrongs exist, what is accomplished by holding meetings with their endless discussions on theoretical subjects? Of what avail is it to seek "spiritual" advancement, if we do not apply ourselves to ameliorate these conditions under which we live?

Page 2: "After the first World War, how many thrones were shaken and crashed! Though we are in the year 1950 and there are improved conditions for labor, yet in the great cities we still have the poor who are exploited in modern ways. Anyone who really knows these conditions would welcome any kind of war, rather than that these

conditions should be perpetuated in 'piping times of peace' for whoso looks beneath the surface notes that it is the devil who pipes and calls the tune."

Here we are informed that "any kind of war" would be welcome as a solution to this problem. What a shocking statement this is! Is that the proper way to deal with this matter? For every problem there is some adequate solution. How is it to be found and made effective—by war?—by killing the culprit? Is this the effective remedy? Are we not trying to outgrow these ideas? Let us rather try to follow the better way, the civilized way, the peaceful way.

War indicates the downfall of Peace. Differences among human beings can never be satisfactorily settled by an appeal to arms. The stronger prevails for a while. But one war leads to another. Even after a war, which is fought by the young men on both sides—who are at times goaded on by the old men who stay at home; even after all the slaying and mass brutality in which the civilians now also are involved in terrible suffering—even then, a conference must be called, areas of compromise must be sought, points of agreement decided upon, and an understanding has to be reached. Let us have our conference *before*, not after a war has been declared and fought.

Page 2: "Hinduism has recognized the need of the fighter, who is also the defender of the people, and as the Gita says, there is nothing so desirable to the Kshatriya as a call to fight in a 'righteous war'."

Page 3: "As the world is at present, it is difficult to say with regard to any particular epoch in the life of a nation whether a continuation of peace is the most desirable condition for the welfare of the nation or whether, as Browning said, a sharp sickness for a time, that is, war, may not be a helpful remedy."

Here is another startling statement which finds its way into the pages of our Brotherhood periodical. Certain remedies are worse than the disease they are prescribed to cure. Who are the Kshatriyas above referred to? They are the so-called warrior caste who are bred and trained to fight. They are not the judges of a just or an unjust cause. They form the instrument that is used to forcibly make effective any order which their commander sees fit to give. Such methods were advocated and used in the dark ages.

But even if this statement does appear in the Gita, are we bound by what is contained in ancient scriptural books? Have we made no progress since then? If this seems to us today contrary to the spirit of Brotherhood, are we to follow it because someone said this centuries ago, and now someone is quoting it? Besides, there are differing interpretations of this Gita "war." It has been construed to de-

note the clash that occurs so frequently within each individual. It is not necessarily a war against our fellow man. Moreover, in the last analysis who has the right to decide on what is, and what is not, a "righteous" war?

Let us further consider. How can war be "a helpful remedy?" War is bitter conflict carried on by force of arms. It wrenches a man from his peaceful pursuits, and conscripts him into an army on one side or the other where unquestioning obedience is the first requisite. He is taught the latest and most improved methods to engage in carnage. The young men on both sides then go out to battle each other. They are exhorted to do so, because they serve a "righteous" cause. Their flags are "blessed" by the "holy" men on both sides. Then the Divine Being is invoked by these "holy" men to aid one side or the other to kill as many of the enemy as possible.

Finally when either side is exhausted or when both sides have had enough terms of peace are declared by suave diplomats, whose bungling generally starts a war in the first place. Thus war is a confession of failure of all other means to settle a dispute. BUT IN THE END WAR DOES NOT SETTLE IT! War does not solve any problem—it creates one. And the greatest irony of the situation is the fact that after the war is over and both sides have suffered immeasurably, the former enemies sometime become allies in fighting another war. War does succeed in a few things. It slaughters the flower of mankind; it produces widows and orphans; it maims mentally and physically untold numbers of persons; it renders many human beings inhuman; it carries indescribable sorrow in its train; it destroys spiritual and material values; it imposes a burden and a blot on future generations—it is a standing disgrace to civilization.

Let us forget. A new approach is being attempted to avoid the dire calamity that threatens to engulf mankind. Humanity is making an effort to abolish these terrible struggles, these trials of blood. It evolved the League of Nations. Though this attempt did not succeed, yet it was an effort in the right direction. Such an effort is not completely lost. Every endeavor towards Peace, however unsteady and wavering it may be, makes the next step a little easier.

And now we have the United Nations, another effort in the evolutionary struggle to eradicate the seeds of war. Shall not we, whose first object is to form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, encourage every attempt to follow the path of Peace? And if these steps of the United Nations are at present faltering, does that not demonstrate all the more, the need for our urgent and undivided support?

(Note: The author of this article is



## OF WHOM IS GENERAL MacARTHUR THE REINCARNATION?

A Complete Public Lecture as given at  
The Theosophical Society of St. Louis

By Charles E. Luntz

NOW AVAILABLE ON 10-INCH DISC RECORDS

This lecture, which drew a capacity audience, was recorded at the time it was given, and by courtesy of Mrs. Brownie Zuber, of St. Louis Lodge, who has volunteered the work of transferring it to discs, we are able to offer it

EITHER FOR RENT OR SALE.

The lecture is not in the formal style of the twelve theosophical talks for which such a gratifying demand was experienced but more on the conversational order, being delivered without notes after lengthy and careful preparation. It brings in both the occult and the astrological background.

The lecture—over 1 hour in duration—covers both sides of nine 10-inch discs.

RENTAL TERMS: \$2.00 for 30 days with \$7.00 deposit additional.

We pay postage one way. Deposit refunded on return of discs.

SALE PRICE: \$9.00 postage paid.

The recorded lecture was given later at the Lodge for the benefit of those unable to attend the original meeting.

Order from ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, 320 MERCHANTS'  
EXCHANGE BLDG., ST. LOUIS, MO.

Proceeds as always to The Theosophical Society of St. Louis

theosophical worker of long standing. In 1904 he shared in welcoming W. Leadbeater to this country and preparing the way for his message. In 1926 he accepted the Chairmanship of the New York Building Committee which aided Mr. L. W. Rogers in the erection of Wheaton Headquarters. In 1950 he received The Olcott Foundation Award for Outstanding Achievement, for his article published in the Oct. 1950 issue of the *American Theosophist*.)

(The End)

### ENVIRONMENT, HEREDITY OR SOUL HISTORY

(Continued from Page 57)

ringing on nervous breakdowns, uncountable aches, pains, swellings, nightmares—just about every ailment real or imaginary that is not traceable to a physical cause. Sometimes the morbidity expresses itself in the field of sex and develops abnormalities which cause horror both in the patient and in those about him.

The types of childhood or adolescent experience responsible for all this are of varied character. Parental neglect or cruelty is said to be largely responsible. Humiliations, or failures at school, disappointments in love, frustrated ambitions—all these, we are as-

sured, become foci of emotional disturbance later on. And then there is the inevitable sex theme which the Freudian school regards as the sole originating cause directly or indirectly and which other schools of thought, while not going quite that far, also make one of the central points in the circle of vicious causation.

The authors who write of these things are learned men in their fields, invariably with much practical experience—and in support of their views able to cite many brilliant successes based on treatment in accord with these views. They may be and should be accorded full credit for these successful outcomes—if they stay successful. The present series is concerned with their failures—and they, too, are many, as these experts if they are honest, which is usually the case, admit. The reasons they give for these failures, where reasons are given, sometimes do not seem very convincing even to themselves. We shall have the temerity in these articles to offer other reasons, deeper reasons, theosophical reasons. We shall even have the greater temerity to suggest that psychiatric cures pronounced permanent may not actually be permanent in the light of reincarnation unless the real seat of the trouble has been eradicated. We

shall also have the fearful presumption to challenge this loading of the unexplained complexes of later life onto far-fetched causes dating back to the early years. We do not say this may not sometimes, perhaps often, be the case. Where permanent results are obtained by techniques based on this assumption the chances favor it. But even then if the cure is only for the duration of one life and the trouble is going to start again next time, the assigned cause was only the proximate one—the real cause further back in time.

Case histories often make pitiful reading. The victim literally seems, in many instances, to have been "framed" by fate. Through no fault of his own he made the wrong contacts, saw the wrong things, was wrongly treated or, being of the temperament he had inherited, reacted in the wrong way to the wrong experiences. It is all environment says one school. It's all heredity, declares another. It's environment and heredity maintains a third. With diffidence becoming to a mere layman the Theosophist respectfully presents a fourth alternative: Gentlemen: (Ladies, too, as some of the books are written by them): You will continue to have failures so long as you continue to base your techniques on the assurance that all these troubles trace either to environment or heredity or both. The most important factor of all you completely ignore—*Soul history*. When you recognize that and correlate that with the splendid work you are doing in the lower fields, your successes will multiply and your failures diminish. Also you will be able to write books that will make those you now write appear like the obsolete speculations of the middle ages.

The Gentlemen—and Ladies—of the Psychiatric and allied professions are not likely, unless Theosophists, to pay any attention to us, but those who believe that reincarnation is a natural law—which probably includes most readers of ANCIENT WISDOM—may give some heed to the statements, conclusions and recommendations that will follow in subsequent articles of this series. And if they do—and put them into practice—it is most unlikely that they will ever have to consult a psychiatrist, though the psychiatrist might learn quite a lot by consulting them.

(To Be Continued)

### MINSTRELSY

A Selection from the Poems  
of Patience Worth

#### Prohibition

Who may stop the young tendril  
Or yet stop the spurt of the wine  
Within the grape?  
Wine, the beauteous lady,  
Man hath besmeared her raiment  
And made ribald her cup,  
Which I say me  
Wert meant for communion.